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According to Conze the *Su.* is the latest in time of the full-scale Prajñāpāramitā texts and must be earlier than A.D. 625 since Candrakīrti quotes it in his *Madhyamakāvatāra.* 1 Hikata puts the *terminus ante quem* in the beginning of the sixth century because Bhāvaviveka (c. 490–570) quotes it in his *Prajñāpradīpa-Mūlamadhyamakavyrtti* (cf. Hikata pp. lxxvi and lxxxii). However, all passages quoted by Bhāvaviveka are from one chapter only (chapter III) and it is therefore not possible to maintain that the entire text existed already in the beginning of the sixth century.

The editions of the Sanskrit text are based upon a single manuscript from the Cambridge University Library. According to Bendall the manuscript was written in the 12–13th centuries. It is therefore much later than the Chinese translation (660-663, cf. T. 2154, ch. 8, p. 555b) and the Tibetan translation by Śilendrabodhi, Jinamitra and Ye-šes-sde (c. 800–825). The Sanskrit text is much closer to the Tibetan translation than to the Chinese translation. This is partly due to the fact that Hsūan-tsang has not always translated the text literally; in many instances he has given a paraphrase in order to bring out more clearly the meaning of the text. Moreover, Hsūan-tsang’s translation is influenced by the rhythm of the Chinese sentence which consists of groups of four characters. On the other hand it is obvious that the Sanskrit text, as represented by the Cambridge manuscript, has been subjected to
changes and corruptions. A great number of these must have been in existence already in the manuscript used by the Tibetan translators in the beginning of the ninth century. Finally, the Tibetan translation seems not to have been made with the same care as translations of other P.P. texts.

In several places the divergences between the three recensions are so great that it is very difficult to arrive at the meaning of the original text. In these cases it is impossible to establish the exact wording by emendations of the Sanskrit text. This is true for instance of pp. 7.9–8.16 (all references are to page and line of Hikata’s edition). Tosaki translates the Sanskrit text but adds in a note a translation of both the Tibetan and the Chinese versions. However, even when the Sanskrit text agrees with the Tibetan translation and not with the Chinese translation, it is not always possible to assume that the text is correctly transmitted. For example, in chapter 4 there occurs the following passage: Ataḥ Śāradvatīputra durlabhatamās te satvāḥ, ye gambhirān dharmān śrutvā 'nuttarāyāṃ samyaksambodhaṃ cittam utpādayanti cchandaṃ ca janayanti, mahākuṣalamūlasamanvāgatāḥ. Nāhaṃ Śāradvatīputra tān satvān mahāsamsārasamprasthitān iti vadāmi, yeṣāṃ ayaṃ prajñāpāramitānirdeṣāḥ śravanāpatham apy āgamiṣyati (Hikata: yanti), śrutvā ca paṭhīsyanti, adhimokṣayiṣyanti, udāraṃ ca prītiśaumanasyaṃ janaiṣyanti, eṣu dharmeṣu cchandaṃ janaiṣyanti, punaḥ punaḥ śravaṇāyāpi. Kah punar vādaḥ uddeṣṭum vā svādhyātum vā parebhyo deśayitum vā (p. 59.11–18). The Tibetan translation agrees with the Sanskrit text apart from two minor differences:

1. mahākuṣalamūlasamanvāgatāḥ, T. dge-ba chen-po dan-'ldan-pa = mahākuṣalamūlasamanvāgatāḥ; 2. ayaṃ prajñāpāramitānirdeṣāḥ, T. šes-rab-kyi pha-röl-pa 'di = iyaṃ prajñāpāramitā. The Chinese translation agrees with the first sentence up to mahākuṣalamūlasamanvāgatāḥ and continues as follows: “I say that they possess great wholesome roots, are provided with great equipment (mahāsambhāra) and are armed with the great armour (mahāsannāhasannaddha). Quickly they will realize the supreme and correct awakening (anuttarasamyaksambodhi). When these beings hear the exposition of this profound Prajñāpāramitā, they will rejoice and desire to hear it again and again. The merit reaped by them is without measure and without end. How much more (will be their merit) when they will be able to bear it in mind, to recite it and to teach it to others.” The Chinese translation has certainly preserved the original text much better than the Sanskrit manuscript. The Sanskrit text makes a very clumsy impression and gives a distorted idea of the original version.
Probably *mahāsamsāra* is the result of a corruption of *mahāsambhāra*.

The editors and translators of the *Su.* have made many useful suggestions for emending the Sanskrit text, but many problems still remain.\(^2\) In quite a few places the Chinese translation is based upon a much more reliable text. However, Hsüang-tsang’s method of translating makes it difficult to make use of it for textual emendations. Nevertheless, it is certainly necessary to quote it each time when it seems to have preserved better the original sense of the text. A complete translation of Hsüang-tsang’s version would be highly welcome. The following notes are limited to the discussion of a few passages only. For the Tibetan translation I have made use of the two editions at my disposal: the Peking and Lhasa editions of the Kanjur and for the Chinese translation I have used volume 7 of the Taishō edition (pp. 1065–1110). As the text is relatively short and moreover divided into seven chapters, I have refrained from giving references to page and line of the Tibetan and Chinese translations.

**Su. 5.6**: *nānapatrapānām.* Ti *nio-tsha ma-*tshal-ciṅ khrel ma-*mchis-pa
rnams-kyi = *nāhrīkānām anapatrapānām.* C. agrees with Ti. Conze translates: “who discredit the doctrine by their deeds” and adds in a note: “Ch.: who lack any shame and are without dread of blame”. In MDPL Conze translates *an-apatrapa* by “one who discredits the doctrine by his deeds”, but *apatrāpya* by “dread of blame”.

**Su. 5.19**: *vrśabhopamānāṃ bodhisatvānāṃ mahāsatvānāṃ abṛḍ-
haśalyānāṃ.* Ti does not have *bodhisatvānāṃ mahāsatvānām.* These two words are to be found in line 22 and have to be omitted in line 19.

**Su. 5.22–6.5**: *Ye dharmaṃ api nopalabhante nābhinvīṣante, kutaḥ
punar adharmaṃ, teṣāṃ vayaṃ Bhagavann arthāya Tathāgataṃ pari-
prṛcchāmo bodhisatvānāṃ mahāsatvānāṃ āśayaśuddhānām . . . . . . . .
saṃśayacchedanakusālānāṃ, [teṣām] vayaṃ Bhagavan satvānāṃ kṛtaśas
Tathāgataṃ pariṃprṛcchāmo bodhisatvānāṃ mahāsatvānām.* Hikata adds teṣām which is not in Ms. and in Ti. However, according to Ti one must put a full stop before *āśayaśuddhānāṃ* and omit teṣām: *bodhisatvānāṃ mahāsatvānāṃ.* *Āśayaśuddhānāṃ . . . . . . . . saṃśayacchedanakusāl-
ānāṃ vayaṃ Bhagavan satvānāṃ kṛtaśas Tathāgataṃ pariṃprṛcchāmo bod-
hisatvānāṃ mahāsatvānāṃ.*

**Su. 7.10**: *Apāramitaiṣā Suvikrāṇtavikrāmin sarvadharmaṃ, tenocyate
prajñāpāramiteti.* According to Hikata’s note C. and Ti have *pāramitaiṣā.* However, C. does not translate *pāramitā* with the usual equivalent but gives a free rendering: “Wisdom is able to penetrate far into the true
nature of the dharmas”. It seems preferable to read pāramitā, as in p. 27.3 where C. renders pāramitā in the same way (Hikata corrects the manuscript reading ā pāramitā to pāramitā. Conze reads ā-pāram-itā and refers to Ti tshu-rol rtags-pa ste. However, in the following passage Conze corrects the readings of the manuscript: ajñā and ajānanā to ājñā and ājānanā. It is impossible to determine the original readings, but C. and Ti show clearly that the negative prefix ā is incorrect.

Su. 7.17–18: yatū satva ajānana, tenocyate prajñeti. Ti ji-ltar sens-can rnam-kyis šes-par ‘gyur-ba de-ltar šes-rab ces bya’o. Cf. p. 27.4–5: yatū punar yuṣmākam ājānana (Ms. ajānana) bhaviṣyanti, Ti ji-ltar khyed šes-par ‘gyur-ba. It is impossible to reconstruct the original readings.

Su. 8.1–3: [Na] jñānagocara eṣa Suvikṛantavikṛmin nājñānagocarabh, nājñānaviṣayo nāpi jñānaviṣayah; aviṣayo hi jñānām; saced ajñānaviṣayah syād, ajñānām syāt. Hikata adds na which is found in Ti but not in C. Ti inverts the order of jñānagocara and ajñānagocara. According to Hikata Ti and C. do not have saced ajñānaviṣayah syād but correspond to: sacej jñāna viṣayah syād. However, C. translates: sacej jñānām viṣayah syād. This follows logically after aviṣayo hi jñānām: “Knowledge is not the object (of knowledge); if it were the object (of knowledge), it would be non-knowledge.” Eṣa refers to prajñā. Conze translates prajñā by ‘wisdom’ and jñāna by ‘cognition’. His translation of this passage is as follows: “It [i.e. prajñā] is not the range of non-cognition, not the sphere of non-cognition, nor also the sphere of cognition; for it is a cognition without an (objective) sphere. If there were an objective sphere in non-cognition, that would be a non-cognition.” However, this passage only makes sense by assuming that prajñā and jñāna are used without making a distinction between the two: “It is not the domain of knowledge, nor the domain of non-knowledge, nor the object of knowledge, nor the object of non-knowledge. For knowledge [i.e. prajñā] is not the object (of knowledge). If knowledge were the object of knowledge (sacej jñānām viṣayah syād), it would be non-knowledge.”


Su. 8.6: na tu tatra kimcid ajñānam, yac chakymā ādarśayitum; idam taj jñānam . . . Read with Ti and C. kimci jñānam.
Su. 8.7–8: *Tena taj jñānaṁ jñānatvena na saṁvidyate, nāpi taj jñānaṁ taṭvenāvasthitam.* C. translates: “Therefore in knowledge there is no property of true knowledge and neither does true knowledge reside in the property of knowledge” (tena jñāne jñānatvam na saṁvidyate, nāpi jñānaṁ jñānatve 'vasthitam'). Ti de‘i-phyir ye-šes de-ni/ye-šes-ṅid-kyis med-do // ye-šes kyaṅ ye-šes-su mi-gnas-te = tena taj jñānaṁ jñānatvena na saṁvidyate, nāpi jñānaṁ jñānenāvasthitam. The instrumentals jñānaṁ and taṭvena or jñānena are predicate instrumentals3: “Therefore that knowledge does not exist as (true) knowledge, that knowledge is not established as (true) knowledge.”


Su. 8.12–14: *Na hi jñānaṁ vacanīyaṁ nāpi jñānaṁ kasyacid viśayaḥ sarvaviṣayavyatikrāntam hi jñānaṁ, na ca jñānaṁ viṣayam, ayam Suvikrāntavikrāmiṇ jñānanirdeśaḥ. Adesto 'pradeśaḥ, yena jñānenāsau jñānīṇāṁ jñānīti saṃkhyām gacchati, yaivaṃ . . .* Hikata’s punctuation is not correct because a full stop must be placed between viṣayam (read viṣayaḥ) and ayam, and the full stop between jñānanirdeśaḥ and adesto must be omitted. *Na ca jñānaṁ viṣayah. Ti ye-šes-kyi yul yāṅ gaṅ-yāṅ ma yin-no = na cāsti kaścīj jñānaviṣayaḥ.* C.: “It can not be said that knowledge is the object of non-knowledge” (na ca jñānam ajñānaviṣayaḥ). Hikata remarks that for jñānīṇāṁ jñānīti Ti has jñānyajñānīti. However, even with these changes Ti does not correspond to the Sanskrit text: phyogs kyaṅ ma yin-pa 'di gaṅ-gis šes-pa de ni / ye-šes-can nam / ye-šes-can ma yin-pa žes-bya-ba'i graṅs-su mi 'gro'o //. Perhaps the original text read: yena jñānena nāsau jñānyajñānīti saṃkhyām gacchati.

Su. 9.14–15: *nirvidhyati nirvedhikā prajñety ucyate, nirvidhyati. Ti seems to have read: . . . prajñā nordhvaṁ nirvidhyati, cf. Ti sten ma rtogs-te. C. is more detailed: “This penetrating wisdom does not exist at all, not above, not below; it is not slow, not quick; it does not progress nor regress; it neither goes nor comes”.


Su. 10.13: *vajropamasamādhir nairvedhikyā prajñayā parigrhitam*
yatra sthāpayati. Read: vajropamam samādhīm (Ms. vajropamam samādhiḥ). Conze’s translation has to be corrected, for samādhīṃ is the object of sthāpayati and pracārayati: “wherever he fixes his concentration and to which objects he directs it”.


Su. 11.13–14: na tasya, yah svabhāvah sa svayamśambhavah. Ti de’i rañ-bzin de ni / rañ-gi ńan-gis ‘jig-cin. Tosani reads: tasya yah svabhāvah sa svayamvibhavah, but yah is not represented in Ti. C. has: “In this way the svabhāva is destroyed by itself.”

Su. 11.14: samudayānantaranirodhā. Hikata remarks: “Ms. is not clear but looks like to be -nuttara°; acc. to Tib. also -nuttara°; but Ch. anantarā; from the context of this paragraph, it should be -ānantara°”. Samudaya is absent in both Ti and C. Ti: mīnām (L. sīnam)-pa ni / bla-na med-pa’i ’gog-pa ste; C. “it is immediate destruction”.


Su. 12.15–16: Na kṣiṃciṣ anyad upalabhyyate, idam taj jñānavigama iti. Instead of idam taj jñānavigama iti Ti has: “apart from the ajñānavigama and the jñānavigama” (mi-śes-pa daṅ bral-ba daṅ / šes-pa daṅ-bral-ba ’di-las). C. translates: “Because one knows in this way cognition and non-cognition and nothing else is apprehended, therefore it is called ajñānavigama”.

Su. 13.22–23: na ca punar dharmadharmaśvaḥbhāvena saṃvidyate. Hikata remarks with S., but that Ti has dharmo dharmasvabhāvena (chos ni chos-kyi ņo-bo Ṉiṣ-kyiṣ). Tosani follows Ti. Conze reads dharmo ’dharmasvabhāvena. C. has “Moreover, both dharma and adharma are without svabhāva”.

Su. 15.1: dhātuḥ saṃketena. Dhātuḥ is not found in Ti and C.

Su. 15.9: sarvadharmaṇubodha. Both Ti and C. have read buddha-dharmāṇubodha.

Su. 15.12: apūrṇatvaṃ tat apariniṣpattiyogena. Read with Ti and C.
apūrnatvam aparinispattiyogena.

Su. 15.15–16: Tena tad. Tosaki suggests reading Naitad but according to Ti one must read te na (de ni . . . . . ma yin-no). Instead of te C. has ‘the Buddhadharmas’.

Su. 16.17: viparyantāḥ is obviously an error for viparyastāḥ.


Su. 17.8–9: vibhāvatī hi tena satvāḥ sarva[saṃ]jñāḥ. Hikata remarks that according to C. and Ti it should be sarva[saṃ]jñāḥ but Ti has satvasamjñā (sems-can-du ‘du-śes-pa) and C. sarvasamjñā. Read: vibhāvatī hi tena satvasamjñā.


Su. 20.1: cittaprakṛtim ca prajānanti. Ti sms-kyi rañ-bžin yañ rab-tu mi-śes = na ca cittaprakṛtim ca prajānanti. C. agrees with S.

Su. 20.3: bodhiprakṛtim ca prajānanti. Ti byañ-chub-kyi rañ-bžin yañ rab-tu mi-śes-te = na ca bodhiprakṛtim ca prajānanti. C. agrees with S.

Su. 20.4: te nājñātacittena bodhiṃ ca paśyanti. C. corresponds to: te ‘nena jñānena cītā bodhiṃ na paśyanti. C. does not translate na bodhau cittaṃ paśyanti, na cītā bodhiṃ paśyanti (p. 20. 4–5).

Su. 20.6: te bhāvanām api nopalabhante. Ti de rnam-par ’jig-par byed-pa de yañ mi-dmigs-śiñ = te vibhāvanām api nopalabhante C.: te bhāvanāṃ ca vibhāvanāṃ ca nopalabhante.

Su. 20.16: Ye punañ Suvikrāntavikrāmin bodher nāpi dūre nābhyyās-anne samanupaśyanti. According to C. bodher must be corrected to bodhim.
Su. 20.25: yo hi naiv’âram upalabhate. Ti gañ pha-rol ñid kyañ mi-dmigs. Tosaki reads: yo hi naiva pâram: This is confirmed by C.

Su. 22.20: anulomaṃ ca samdhâyanti. Conze translates: “they explain (their secret intent) in agreement with just the fact”. However, neither Ti nor C. support this explanation. Ti rjes-su mthun-par smra-bar byed-do; C. “they harmonize this and that so that there is no mutual opposition”. Probably one must read samdhâyanti as has been proposed by Matsumoto. According to Edgerton dhâyati and dhâyate (from dhâ-) occur chiefly in comp. with antara-. C. is correct in translating samdhâyati by ‘to harmonize, to make agree’.

Su. 23.3–4: na ca kãmciḍ anurakṣyaṃ dharmam deśayati. Conze puts a question mark after his translation: “Although he does not demonstrate any dharma which can be preserved”. Ti has read also anurakṣyaṃ (rjes-su srūñ-ba’i chos), but according to C. one must read kãmciḍ anurakṣya: “he teaches the dharma without holding back anything”.


Su. 29.18: Na hi Suvikrântavikrâmin rūpaṃ rūpasvabhâvam jahâti. Ti translates jâñâti (śes-so), but C. agrees with S. Also in line 19 Ti has jâñâti but C. jahâti.

Su. 37.16: nirvṛtti nānirvṛttih. According to Hikata C. has nirvṛti and anirvṛti but Ti agrees with S. However, Ti has nirvṛti (ldog-pa) and anirvṛti (mi-ldog-pa). In 41.5 Ti translates nirvṛtti with grub-pa.

Su. 41.16–17: na ca svapnasvabhâvanirdeśaḥ kaścit samvidyate. Ti agrees with S. but according to C. one must read: na ca svapnasvabhâvah kaścit samvidyate.

Su. 42.3: svabhâvanirdeśaḥ. Read svabhâvah (see Hikata note 1).

Su. 42.4: mâyâsvabhâvanirdeśasya svabhâvo. Read with C. mâyâ-svabhâvanirdeśo.

Su. 42.19: maricinirdeśasvabhâvo. Read with C. maricisvabhâvanirdeśo.

Su. 43.2: prajâpâramitînirdeśapadaṃ cādhigacchati śravanañya. According to C. one must read: prajâpâramitâ nirdeśapadâṃ cādhigacchati śravanañâya.

Su. 43.2–3: na ca kasyacid dharmasya nirdeśaśravanañya gacchati. Conze translates: “it is not the exposition of any dharma which reaches the hearing”. Obviously, Conze reads: nirdeśaḥ śravanañya. Ti chos gañ bstan-pa thos-par ’gyur-ba med-do. However, C. has: “The dharma which is heard is entirely without svabhâva”: na ca kasyacid dharmasya
svabhāvaḥ śravaṇa ya gacchati.

Su. 43.7–8: kutaḥ punas tannirdeśasvabhāvopalabdhir bhaviṣyati. C.: “Why? The mass of foam does not exist, Suvikrāntavikrāmin. How much less will there be an exposition of its svabhāva”: Tat kasmād dhetoḥ! Phenapiṇḍa eva na saṃvidyate, kutaḥ punas tatsvabhavānirdeśo bhaviṣyati.

Su. 43.24: prajñāpāramitāyā nirdeśaḥ kāryaṃ ca karoti. C.: tasya nirdeśena kāryaṃ ca karoti.


Su. 47.1–2: nāsyāṃ kaścid upalabhya yo 'bhisambuddhaḥ. (Ms. (bhisambuddhā). Read with C. 'bhisamboddhā. Ti has nāsyāṃ kaścit parinippanno dharma upalabhya yo 'bhisambuddhaḥ: gaṅ mñoṅ-par rdzogs-par rtogs-pa yoṅs-su grub-pa'i chos gaṅ-yaṅ mi dmigs-so.

Su. 47.21–22: Paramārtha jñānadarśanasaṃvṛtyasvabhāvato. C. adds jñānadarśana between saṃvṛti and asvabhāvato.

Su. 52.22–23: na kaṃcid dharmam upalabhate, na samanupaśyati, yaṃ dharmam jānīyād yasya vā dharmasya jñāpayitrā vā bhavet. Ti chos gaṅ s’es-pa ’am / chos gaṅ s’es-par byed-par ’gyur-ba’i chos gaṅ-yaṅ mi dmigs-so = na kaṃcid dharmam upalabhate yaṃ dharmam jānīyād yasya vā dharmasya jñāpayitā vā bhavet. C. agrees with Ti.

Su. 58.6–7: ca yesām pariśanane, te tathārūpāḥ satpurūsāḥ. Ti gaṅ-gi (L.T.T. gis) yoṅs-su s’es-pa de daṅ de-dag ni = ca yesām pariṣanam, te te. In the following lines read.;, te te instead of te, te.

Su. 61.2: parinippanthi darśanopayaṇaḥ. Read: parinippanthidarśanam upayaṇaḥ, cf.: Ti yoṅs-su grub-par mthon-bar ņe-bar ’gro-ba ma yin-no. See also p. 61.3, 8, 9, 13 and 14 where the same emendation has to be made. Probably the instrumentals have crept into the text under the influence of the instrumentals in the preceding passage.


Su. 68.12–14: yā ’pi sā ’yuṣmaṇi Śāradvatīputra prajñā lokottarā nirvedhagāmini, tasyā api prajñāpāramitānirdeśaṃ nopaiti. Tosaki separates correctly prajñāpāramitā and nidarśanam. Conze omits tasyā in his translation: “It is because this is a wisdom which is supramundane and which leads to penetration that the perfection of wisdom does not lend itself to explanation”. Tasyā refers to prajñā. “As to prajñā, the per-
fection of wisdom does not envisage the explanation of it (i.e. prajñā)”
(“does not envisage the explanation” is Conze’s rendering of nidarśanam
upaiti in the preceding passage).

Su. 68.14–16: Tad yathā "yuṣmaṇ Śāradvatīputra dharmo nidarśanam
nopaiti kasyacid dharmasya, kathāṃ tasya vodāhāranydēso (Hikata tasya
evo-, but Ms. tasyaivo-) bhaviṣyati. Tosaki omits dharmo but this is
found both in Ti and in C., cf. Ti chos gaṅ ñes-par bstan-par yaṅ ñe-bar
mi-'gro-ba'i chos de ji-ltar brjod-ciṅ ñes-par bstan-par 'gyur.

Su. 71.12–13: na tathā yais te, te dharmā ye ca na tathā (Ms. 'vitathā)
yathā gṛhiṇās. Ti: chos de ni / ji-lta-ba bźin-du ma yin-no // gaṅ-dag ji-ltar
bzuṅ-ba de-bźin-du ma yin-pa. C.: “Such dharmas are not so. As they
are seized, not such are their marks.” Read: na tathā yathā te te dharmā,
ye ca na tathā yathā gṛhiṇās (?).

Su. 72.4: Sarvaśaṃ (Ms. sarveśaṃ) Suvikrāntavikrāmin vikalpacaryā.
Ti. rab-kyi rtsal-gyis rnam-par gnon-pa / 'di (T.T. de)-dag thams-cad ni /
rnam-par rtog-pa la spyod-pa'o = sarvaśaī . . .

Su. 72.5: sarvavikalpapraheṇā. Tosaki emends to sarvakalpapraheṇā
in accordance with Ti. However, C. has sarvakalpavikalpapraheṇā.

Su. 72.5–6: kalpa iti Suvikrāntavikrāmin vikalpanaisā sarvadharmānām.
C.: kalpa iti kalpasyabhāvah sarvadharmānām, vikalpa iti kal-
paviśeṣaḥ sarvadharmānām.

Su. 73.7: yato. Read yad (Ti gaṁ).

Su. 73.11: nocetya. C. adds: viparyāsa iti.

Su. 73.13: Jñāto (Ms. jñātaṃ) hi tena viparyāśo 'bhūta iti. The reading
of the manuscript jñātaṃ must be kept.

Su. 73.19: tena sārdham [a]viparyāśaḥ sthita. Ti de'i phyir de phyin-ci-
log med-par gnas-pa = tena sa 'viparyāśasthita.

Su. 73.19: caryāyāṃ (Ms. caryā) na vikalpayati. Read caryāṃ na vi-
kalpayati.

Su. 74.24: tena ca caryā-'pagatā. Ti de spyod-pa med-pa ste = te
caryā-'pagatās.

Su. 78.18–19: pariṇātā hi ten’ ātmasatvārambaṇaprapkṛtipariśuddhā
(Ms. . . . -ārampaṇapariṇā). Read: prakṛtipariśuddhām hi ten’ ātmasa-
tvārambaṇam pariṇātām.

Su. 84.5–6: prajñāpāramitācaryā cittajanikā, tenocyate ’cintyateti.
Ti sans-kyis bskyed-pa (T.T. sans-kyi skyed-pa) ma yin-pa’i phyir-te /
de'i phyir bsam-gyis mi khyab-pa Žes bya'o = cittajanitā, tenocyate ’cin-
tyetī. C. agrees with Ti but adds: na ca cittajanikā, tenocyate ’cintyeti.

Su. 84.7–8: cittaṃ cittajam iti Suvikrāntavikrāminś cetasaḥ pratiśed-
ha eṣaḥ. Ti sems žes bya-ba de ni | sems rab-tu rtog-pa’o (T.T. gtogs-pa’o) = cittam iti. Suvikrāntavikrāminś cetasaḥ prativedha eṣaḥ. C.: “Non-production of mind also is perverted view. If one understands that both thought and mental elements (caitasika) do not exist, then there is absence of perverted view.”


Su. 87.16–17: Vaiśāradyabhūmir iyāṃ Suvikrāntavikrāmin dharmaneyam (Ms. dharmaneyam) prajñāpāramitācaryā. Dharmaneyam is missing in both Ti and C. and has to be omitted.

Su. 88.10: na kañcid dharman, yat prajñāpāramitāyāṃ na yojayati. Read: na kañcid dharman, yaṃ . . . .

Su.92.16–17: phenaṇḍopānā hi sarvadharmā avimardanakṣamatvāt. Ti translates avimardanakṣamatvāt with mīne (L. mi-ñe) mi-bzod-pa’i phyir = vimardana-a-kṣamatvāt. C. has: “because they can not be picked up and rubbed”. A-vimardanakṣamatvāt means: “because they do not withstand crushing”. Conze translates: “because they are easily crushed”.

Su. 96.12–13: tāṁ api nirālambanavaśikatāṁ na manyate. Ti dmigs-pa med-pa dañ / dmigs-pa ya-ma-brla de-dag la yañ rlon-sems-su mi byed-do = tāṁ api nirālambanān ālambanavaśikān na manyate. C. agrees with Ti. For ālambanavaśika see Asṭasāhasrikā p. 265. According to Haribhadra ālambana-vaśika means ‘depending on an ālambana’ (ālambana-paratantra). Conze translates ‘devoid of objective support’ (The Perfection of Wisdom, p. 175) but vaśika cannot have the meaning ‘empty’ as second member of a compound.

Su. 98.20–22: Yāvat kalpanā tāvad vikalpanā, nāasty atra vikalpanāsamucchedah. Yatra punaḥ Suvikrāntavikrāmin na kalpanā na vikalpanā, tatra kalpasamucchedah. Tosani emends vikalpanāsamucchedah to kalpanā-. Ti has mi-rtog-pa which corresponds to vikalpanā. For both vikalpanāsamucchedah and kalpasamucchedah C. has kalpanāvikalpanāsamucchedah which is certainly the original reading.

Su. 99.1: anto hi Suvikrāntavikrāmin kalpo vikalpo (Ms. ’vikalpaḥ) viparyāsasamutthitas. Ti rtog-pa dañ / mi-rtog-pa ni / phyin-ci log-pa las huyin-bas med-pa’i phyir-ro = asanto hi Suvikrāntavikrāmin kalpo vikalpaś ca viparyāsasamutthitās. Tosaki changes anto to asan but it is more likely that anto is the result of a corruption of asanto.
Su. 100.7–8: dharmadānam. Ti chos-kyi sbyin-pa la = dharmadāne.
Su. 101.20: duḥkhiito vedanāttamanā. Hikata explains vedanāttamanā by Skt. vedanārtamanā and Pāli vedanāṭṭamanā. However, neither Ti nor C. translates vedanāttamanā and it is probably a corruption for 'nattamanā.
Su. 106.15: kāṅkṣāyitvatvaṁ vā bandhāyitvatvaṁ vā. For bandhāyitvatvaṁ read dandhāyitvatvaṁ, cf. p. 22.17 and Edgerton, BHSD s.v. dandhāyati.
Su. 117.21–24: Nāhaṁ Suvikrāntavikrāmin bodhisatvasya kāmycid dharmam evaṁ kṣipraṁ paripūrikaram samanupaśyāmi sarvādharmānāṁ [an]yatheha praṇāpūramitāyāṁ yathā nirdiṣṭāyāṁ abhiyogaḥ. Hikata changes yatheha to anyytheha. However, aparām has to be added between kāmycid and dharmam and sarvādharmānāṁ has to be emended to sarvabuddhadharmānāṁ, cf. Ti saṁs-rgyas-kyi chos thams-cad myur-du yoṅs-su rdzogs-par byed-pa de-lta-bu byaṅ-chub bios-dpa’i (T.T. dpa’) chos gzan gaṅ-yaṅ ṇas ma mthoin-no; kāmycid aparām dharmam . . . . . sarvabuddhadharmānāṁ yattheha praṇāpūramitāyāṁ yathānirdiṣṭāyāṁ . . . . . C. agrees with Ti.
Su. 120.7–9: iyām mahāprthivī, meghān pratītya snigdha bhavati, anupūrvena ca pravarṣati, devenābhīṣyandamāṇā upary upary udakaṁ pravarṣanti, yenotsadhīṁ (Ms. utsāhaṁ) bahavo 'nugacchanti. Read: . . . bhavati, anupūrvena ca pravarṣatā devenābhīṣyandamāṇā, [mehgaḥ] upary upary udakaṁ pravarṣanti, yenotsā bahavo 'nugacchanti (?). Ti char mthar-gyas bab-pas baṅs-nas chu 'byuṅ-ste gaṅ-du (L. gaṅ) chu-mig maṅ-po 'byuṅ-ba.
Su. 121.17: sarvā diṣṭā prabhā dhyāmikaroti. Diṣṭā is not translated by Ti and C. Read: sarvāḥ prabhā.

Su. 123.20: Abaddha iti. Ti rtogs-pa med-pa translates probably avedha but according to the context and C. the correct reading must be abandha and not abaddha. Abandha corresponds to asaṅga (123.18). Moreover, a corruption from abandha to avedha is more likely than from abaddha to avedha.

Su. 126.9–10: Teśāṃ kulaputrāṇāṃ kuladuhitṛṇāṃ ca bhūyo mārebhyah pāpiyobhyah (sic!) 'bhayam (Ms. mārāḥ pāpiyāṃso bhayam) pratikāmśitavyam. Read: na ca bhūyo mārāt pāpiyaso bhayam, cf. Ti bdud sōg-can-gyis 'jigs-so sīṇam-du dogs-par mi bgyi' o. A corruption of mārāt to mārāh has led to the change of pāpiyaso to pāpiyāṃso.


NOTES

1 The Short Prajñāpāramitā Texts, p. i,

2 Several passages have been discussed by Conze in his reviews of the editions of the Su. by Matsumoto (IIJ, 2, 1958, pp. 316–318) and Hikata (IIJ, 3, 1959, pp. 232–234). His translation does not always follow Hikata’s text. Tosani gives a list of corrections (pp. 316–315).